

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 94 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #304
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 11 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 304

Today's Topics:

 CW - THE ONLY MODE! (2 msgs)
 CW ... My view.
 CW Argument...
 Existing regulations limit our advancement. (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 94 01:02:00 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
sundog.tiac.net!news3.sprintlink.net!news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!
channel1!alan.wilensky@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW - THE ONLY MODE!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

TM>Where am I going with this???? Simple, If you like CW... GREAT, if
TM>you don't like CW... GREAT, Just don't try and kill it or belittle
TM>it. Until you take the time and EFFORT to develop your CW skills to
TM>where you can receive it in your head at 30+ WPM your missing the
TM>point (And all the FUN).

What , 20 WPM ain't good enough? I'm tired, I've been at too long, there
is something wrong with my brain...ahhhh.

For out and out range, CW is good, but SS is better. And I can prove it.

Alan Wilensky, General Manager

Interactive Workplace Division
Vicom, LTD.
Phone: Edmonton Office
11603 165 St.
abm@world.std.com

, CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 1994 08:00:55 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: CW - THE ONLY MODE!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.2151.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>

>For out and out range, CW is good, but SS is better. And I can prove it.

Hee hee - tell that to the guys on the QRP newsgroup who are vying for the xx-thousand miles per watt awards. I posted a QRP story a few months back of someone using 10 mW on 20 or 15 meters (can't recall) and making it into Europe. CW of course.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 94 01:02:00 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
sundog.tiac.net!news3.sprintlink.net!news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!
channel1!alan.wilensky@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ... My view.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

MS>We await your list of "approved" homebrew fields and projects so that
MS>we may begin our re-education.

Well , I'm a new no-code,(passed general element too.) awaiting my call,
and I am going to apply my experience in designing SS military radios to
VHF! There are some very nice chipsets out there. Oy vey...you wouldnt
believe what you can do with these things, you'll plotz.

Im going to pass the 20 wpm, walk through the advanced and extra exam,
and then I'm going to put my shoulder to get the code test removed from
the exams. Period. CW is just another mode. No better, no worse.

CW has no outstanding merit that makes it a scared cow for ARS testing, other than ITU convention. But we can fix that.

I support your right to use CW if you wish. I will not ask that it be banned.

Alan Wilensky, General Manager

Interactive Workplace Division
Vicom, LTD.
Phone: Edmonton Office
11603 165 St.
abm@world.std.com

⌵ CmpQwk #UNREG⌵ UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 94 01:02:00 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
sundog.tiac.net!news3.sprintlink.net!news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!
channel1!alan.wilensky@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW Argument...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

DP>If you are so stupid that code is the only thing that you think makes
DP>an amateur then I feel sorry for you, and YOUR version of amateur
DP>radio will die out with no one at the funeral.

DP>

DP>There are many people who CAN NOT learn the code. I know several. If
DP>you can, fine. That does not make a you a ham, it MAY make you a
DP>post card collector. That is not the purposes of the US Amateur
DP>Radio Service.

DP>I run a weekly code practice on one of our 2-Meter repeaters and have
DP>helped MANY hams develop their code proficiency. I have stated many
DP>times in the past that I do not have a problem doing the code.
DP>However, the code is NOT relevant to an amateur radio license any
DP>more. Thus, it is not relevant to test for it.

If I could shake your hand, I would. Consider it shaken. I have a real
problem with the code. After a year of diligent practice, certain letter
groups evade me. But I still try. Advanced and Extra tests will be
passed shortly.

Alan Wilensky, General Manager

Interactive Workplace Division

Vicom, LTD.
Phone: Edmonton Office
11603 165 St.
abm@world.std.com

, CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Sun, 10 Jul 1994 16:20:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

>

>>EVERY STATION MUST HAVE A CONTROL OPERATOR. PERIOD. A station under
>>automatic control need not have the control operator *actually at the
>>control point*, but it MUST have a control operator. He's the

>

>Take out "control operator" and insert "licensee." An amateur station MUST
>be licensed, but a control operator is NOT needed under the few circumstances
>where the FCC allows automatic control; even outside those circumstances the
>control operator need not be the station's licensee, but must be authorized BY
>that licensee. And the licensee is still liable for violations that occur when
>the station is controlled by a different control operator or is under automatic
>control.

No Ed, Dave is correct. All stations MUST have a control operator. A
station under automatic control MUST have a control operator, that control
operator need not BE at a CONTROL POINT. THAT is the definition of
automatic control in Part 97.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Sun, 10 Jul 1994 16:14:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!

caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

>

>>If someone calls the reverse autopatch, it results in RF being
>>generated on an amateur band which is not under the control of any
>>licensed control operator. That's illegal. End of story.

>

>No, if someone calls the autopatch, it results in the repeater control system
>answering the phone, possibly receiving DTMF tones, and -- if those tones
>conform to conditions set by the repeater's licensee -- then causing the
>repeater to transmit a signal. A lot less direct than a "normal" repeater
>operation, and also different in that the actual message transmitted is always
>one approved in advance by the licensee, NOT one composed by whoever placed the
>call.

>

>Now, if you want to argue that such a transmission -- which is NOT repeating
>the signal of another amateur station -- is therefore not one that can be made
>under automatic control, I'd tend to agree. But that would also seem to apply
>to a repeater that comes on every ten minutes with a "VE Testing Saturday At
>2 PM Mayfield High Auditorium W4XXX Repeater" synthesized message. Are those
>legal?

Yes they are legal. A repeater can have ancillary functions. All the things that we are talking about are ANCILIARY to the normal function of the repeater. The PURPOSE of the patch, announcements and reverse patch are to provide ancillary functions to the users of the repeater. And use of those functions can be restricted by the repeater trustees.

By the way, the same control operator is responsible for all operations of the repeater, even if he/she is not at a control point.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Sun, 10 Jul 1994 16:25:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!

wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>An automatically-controlled station that comes on every 10 minutes
>regardless of whether anyone at all transmitted on the input is a
>beacon station, not a repeater. If your machine is below 450, it's
>truly unlikely that it's in a Beacon subband. I'd say that was
>illegal. They're annoying, anyway. It's common, though. Same for
>every-10-minute-until-Kingdom-come IDs. Go for it ... on 1.2 GHz!

I would still argue that the beacon type activity is incidental to the main function and purpose of the repeater. Just if a guy is driving and has his car radio up just loud enough to be heard over the mic. It is STILL not the INTENT of the station to transmit music. Or the better example is the guy at a public service event where he is stationed near a band (like the Cleveland Revco Marathon finish line) the transmission of music is INCIDENTAL to the intent of the transmission.

>Backing up a step. I don't think a reverse patch is legal under any
>circumstances under automatic control.

If you allow that 97.109 (e) is applicable to repeater operations NO, NOT-A, ZERO, ALL!!! Patches are illegal under automatic control. No exception. PERIOD. Either reverse patches are ok, or NO patches are. There is no distinguishing between the two.

>The way to get around this is
>to give everyone separate passwords, ensure that under automatic
>control only eligible control operators' passwords work, that
>accessing the reverse autopatch is logged (and maybe taped, perhaps
>just for the first minute, for a voice sample?) for clear
>identification, and that anyone who lends their password out or
>otherwise violates the rules has their reverse patch privileges
>stripped. This would then qualify as wireline remote control, and
>would be legal anywhere on the bands. Plus, the station licensee
>would have enough control over access.

If I, as a control operator is at ANY control point the system is NO LONGER under automatic control. THAT IS the definition of automatic control. Whether that control is wired or wireless is irrelevant.

>I don't think you'd even have to have a warning tone - you could just
>put the caller on the air, say with VOX and I guess the ability for
>transmissions on the input to lock him out. It might be nice if he
>gave his own callsign, but he'd clearly have to formally ID with the

>repeater's callsign rather than his or else he'll be sending false
>signals, since it's not his station. Presumably, the automatic IDer
>would do this for him. (Maybe requiring him to say KD1JFR/R, WF3DFF
>controlling", or something, at least once, would be good.) But these
>are musings.

No, the repeater would ID and meet the requirement. I do this every week with our code practice net. The IDer goes off right under my MCW signal. Since I am not operating any station EXCEPT the repeater the ID takes care of its self. If I was local at the local mic I would use the repeater call (and have), as you said.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
==+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Sun, 10 Jul 1994 16:02:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CsMDw, <CsnAJ9.79J@world.std.com>, <pI3QRb5.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

: David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

:

: >If someone calls the reverse autopatch, it results in RF being
: >generated on an amateur band which is not under the control of any
: >licensed control operator. That's illegal. End of story.

:

: No, if someone calls the autopatch, it results in the repeater control system
: answering the phone, possibly receiving DTMF tones, and -- if those tones
: conform to conditions set by the repeater's licensee -- then causing the
: repeater to transmit a signal. A lot less direct than a "normal" repeater
: operation, and also different in that the actual message transmitted is always
: one approved in advance by the licensee, NOT one composed by whoever placed the
: call.

Okay, I've engaged in some possibility thinking and think an argument could be made that that alert tone is telemetry, which seems legal most anywhere. If the call were indeed DMTF-screened at least as well

as an ATM bank card, AND there were a control operator at the control point, this seems legal enough. I think it's better amateur practice to have the alert tone on a control link frequency, but that's MHO, I guess. Best would be off-air screening, but that's not quite as convenient, now is it?

:

: Now, if you want to argue that such a transmission -- which is NOT repeating
: the signal of another amateur station -- is therefore not one that can be made
: under automatic control, I'd tend to agree. But that would also seem to apply
: to a repeater that comes on every ten minutes with a "VE Testing Saturday At
: 2 PM Mayfield High Auditorium W4XXX Repeater" synthesized message. Are those
: legal?

An automatically-controlled station that comes on every 10 minutes regardless of whether anyone at all transmitted on the input is a beacon station, not a repeater. If your machine is below 450, it's truly unlikely that it's in a Beacon subband. I'd say that was illegal. They're annoying, anyway. It's common, though. Same for every-10-minute-until-Kingdom-come IDs. Go for it ... on 1.2 GHz!

Backing up a step. I don't think a reverse patch is legal under any circumstances under automatic control. The way to get around this is to give everyone separate passwords, ensure that under automatic control only eligible control operators' passwords work, that accessing the reverse autopatch is logged (and maybe taped, perhaps just for the first minute, for a voice sample?) for clear identification, and that anyone who lends their password out or otherwise violates the rules has their reverse patch privileges stripped. This would then qualify as wireline remote control, and would be legal anywhere on the bands. Plus, the station licensee would have enough control over access.

I don't think you'd even have to have a warning tone - you could just put the caller on the air, say with VOX and I guess the ability for transmissions on the input to lock him out. It might be nice if he gave his own callsign, but he'd clearly have to formally ID with the repeater's callsign rather than his or else he'll be sending false signals, since it's not his station. Presumably, the automatic IDer would do this for him. (Maybe requiring him to say KD1JFR/R, WF3DFF controlling", or something, at least once, would be good.) But these are musings.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: 10 Jul 1994 22:22:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!scorpion.ch.intel.com!
cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2visoe\$hjl@umcc.umcc.umich.edu>, <2vk303\$ef8@chnews.intel.com>,
<Cso0xv.Iv3@news.hawaii.edu>,*
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

In article <Cso0xv.Iv3@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:

>
>Hi Cec, I have a hypothetical question for you. What would you do if
>you wanted to become a commercial airline pilot but your eyesight
>was such that you couldn't pass the FAA medical exam? Accept your
>limitation and go on with life? Or try to change the regulations?
>Jeff NH6IL
>

Hi again, Jeff, you can't possibly compare a life-and-death license to
a hobby license. I'm glad to report that my friend was allowed to send
at 25wpm instead of receive at 13wpm and is now a General. I guess you
are also against wheelchair ramps, handicapped parking, etc.

73, KG7BK, 00TC, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 1994 01:08:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CsqF7z.4Jo@world.std.com>, <071094162545Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<Csr8Jv.44I@world.std.com>org
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

(and Dave quoting me...)

>: I would still argue that the beacon type activity is incidental to the
>: main function and purpose of the repeater. Just if a guy is driving and
>: has his car radio up just loud enough to be heard over the mic. It is
>: STILL not the INTENT of the station to transmit music. Or the better
>: example is the guy at a public service event where he is stationed near a
>: band (like the Cleveland Revco Marathon finish line) the transmission of

>: music is INCIDENTAL to the intent of the transmission.

>

>Well, I still think it's a 1-way transmission, legal for beacons,
>illegal for repeaters. It's not incidental, because it's so easy to
>fix - have it announce just once after a QSO, instead of every 10
>minutes forever. Or move to a proper frequency. But not every 10
>minutes forever outside of a beacon subband. It's not harmless,
>either - with our crowded bands, it could cause needless interference
>to legitimate communications. If no one's been talking on the
>frequency for hours, it can hardly be considered a "transmission
>necessary to disseminate information bulletins." Not a hanging
>offense, though.

Not exactly a beacon as defined in Part 97.3 (a)

(9) Beacon. An amateur station transmitting communications *FOR THE
PURPOSES OF OBSERVATION OF PROPAGATION AND RECEPTION OR OTHER RELATED
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVITIES*.

(Emphs. added)

Since a repeater IDing is NOT for the above purpose, it is NOT a beacon.
It may have some of the characteristics of a beacon, but it is not one.

>: >Backing up a step. I don't think a reverse patch is legal under any
>: >circumstances under automatic control.

>

>: If you allow that 97.109 (e) is applicable to repeater operations NO,
>: NOT-A, ZERO, ALL!!! Patches are illegal under automatic control. No
>: exception. PERIOD. Either reverse patches are ok, or NO patches are. There
>: is no distinguishing between the two.

>

>Yes, patches are illegal under automatic control. A reverse patch is
>a patch. Ergo, it's illegal under automatic control. I said nothing
>about other patches, but they're just as illegal, you're right.

>

>: >The way to get around this is
>: >to give everyone separate passwords, ensure that under automatic
>: >control only eligible control operators' passwords work, that
>: >accessing the reverse autopatch is logged (and maybe taped, perhaps
>: >just for the first minute, for a voice sample?) for clear
>: >identification, and that anyone who lends their password out or
>: >otherwise violates the rules has their reverse patch privileges
>: >stripped. This would then qualify as wireline remote control, and
>: >would be legal anywhere on the bands. Plus, the station licensee
>: >would have enough control over access.

>

>: If I, as a control operator is at ANY control point the system is NO

>: LONGER under automatic control. THAT IS the definition of automatic
>: control. Whether that control is wired or wireless is irrelevant.
>

>Exactly. And if the person making a "reverse patch" is in fact an
>appointed control operator, you're no longer under automatic control
>and things are just ducky. If he's unlicensed (say), you're still
>under automatic control and any patch is illegal. Hence the
>passwords.

IF the person has control at a control point, he/she is a control operator
and the station is no longer under automatic control.

If ANY control operator is at a control point the station is NOT under
automatic control. Then would a reverse patch be legal?

>: No, the repeater would ID and meet the requirement. I do this every week
>: with our code practice net. The IDer goes off right under my MCW signal.
>: Since I am not operating any station EXCEPT the repeater the ID takes care
>: of its self. If I was local at the local mic I would use the repeater call
>: (and have), as you said.
>

>Requirement, yes. In the last paragraph I was speculating on prudence
>- it might be nice to have his call on the tape. I don't think it's
>necessary. We don't disagree here.

Nice? Maybe. But nothing requires it.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Sun, 10 Jul 1994 15:18:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!uhog.mit.edu!
news.mtholyoke.edu!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070894162111Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CsnC1H.GoK@world.std.com>,
<hK3xZzz.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:
: David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

:
: >EVERY STATION MUST HAVE A CONTROL OPERATOR. PERIOD. A station under
: >automatic control need not have the control operator *actually at the
: >control point*, but it MUST have a control operator. He's the
:
: Take out "control operator" and insert "licensee." An amateur station MUST
: be licensed, but a control operator is NOT needed under the few circumstances
: where the FCC allows automatic control; even outside those circumstances the
: control operator need not be the station's licensee, but must be authorized BY
: that licensee. And the licensee is still liable for violations that occur when
: the station is controlled by a different control operator or is under automatic
: control.

I have to ask if you read 97.9. If not, please do so now. The first sentence. Then read 97.109(a-d).

See? There must be control operator. He need not be at a control point while under automatic control (is that what you meant above?), but there must always be a control operator.

Other than what sounds like terminology, what you've said is essentially true. There must be a station licensee, and if there's another control operator, they're jointly responsible for the station. The control operator under automatic control need not be the station licensee, who could be on vacation. It usually is, though.

We're all used to using "have a control operator" as shorthand for "have a control operator on duty at a control point," but they're not strictly speaking the same thing.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #304
